

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claim 61 was objected to for failing to include a period at the end of the claim. Applicants have amended claim 61 by adding a period at the end of the claim. Applicants have also added the word “or” prior to the last recited element of the claim.

Allowed claim 27 has also been similarly amended.

35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 11, 14, 21, 56, 66, 69, 76, 85, and 86 were rejected under 102 as being anticipated either by Malik or Pfister. Both of these references are directed to articles for application to a person’s skin such as bandages and skin patches, wherein the adhesive layer is used, in part, to shield the antimicrobial layer from exposure to the elements.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 56, and 86 to clarify that applicants’ invention is directed to providing an exposed bactericidal surface rather than unexposed. In particular, the support, the antimicrobial, and the adhesive layers are arranged in a particular order different from Malik and Pfister to achieve the objects of the present invention. All claims depending from claims 1 or 56, namely, 11, 14, 21, 66, 69, and 76, also include these limitations and are also allowable over Malik and Pfister.

Applicants have amended independent claim 85 to more clearly recite an embodiment of the present invention wherein antimicrobial sheets are arranged in a stack, such as shown in FIG. 5 and its corresponding description at page 11 of the present application. The prior art references made of record do not mention such an embodiment.

35 USC § 103

Claims 15-17, 20, 70-72, and 75 were rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfister. Because claims 15-17, and 20 depend from claim 1 as amended herein, and because claims 70-72, and 75 depend from claim 56 as amended herein, all these claims are allowable for the reasons explained under section heading 35 USC § 102 above with regard to claims 1 and 56.

Allowable Subject Matter

The examiner indicated that claims 22-42 are allowed.


The examiner indicated that claims 2, 12, 13, 18, 19, 57, 59-65, 67, 68, 73, and 74 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended claims 2, 12, 13, 57, 62, 63, 65, and 67 as indicated by the examiner. Hence, applicants believe these claims to now be allowable. Because claims 59-61, 64, 73, and 74 depend directly or indirectly from these claims, they include the limitations of the claims from which they depend and are also allowable.

Because claims 18, 19, and 68 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 56, as amended herein, these claims are allowable for the reasons explained under section heading 35 USC § 102 above with regard to claims 1 and 56.

In view of the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that the claims in their present form are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 36,678

Eugene I. Shkurko
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-253-0123
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.